REMARKS

In response to the Office Action mailed on January 18, 2008, Applicants respectfully request reconsideration based on the above claim amendments and the following remarks. Applicants respectfully submit that the claims as presented are in condition for allowance.

Claim Disposition

Claims 1-24 are pending in the application. The Examiner has rejected claims 1-24. Claims 1, 15 and 23 have been amended, leaving Claims 1-24 for consideration upon entry of the current amendments.

Claim Rejections - 35 U.S.C. § 103

Claims 1-24 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over U.W. Patent No. 7,103,511 to Petite (hereinafter "Petite) in view of U.S. Patent No. 7,130,895 B2 to Zintel, et al (hereinafter "Zintel").

Claims 1, 15 and 23 have been amended to include a limitation that configuration information produced or stored in the producer devices is not altered by requests made by the consumer devices.

Zintel requires that a producer, device upon receiving a request from a consumer device, modify, reconfigure, reformat or even translate the data so that a consumer device can receive it. Zintel, for example (column 24 line 49 through column 25 line 44), details a process of a rehydrator getting a variable value from a controller device (i.e. producer device). This description makes clear that the burden of recognizing the variable name, finding its value in internal memory and responding to the rehydrator fall upon the control server, which is part of the controller device (i.e. producer device). The rehydrator (column 7, line 8) allows each resource to be converted to a form usable by a computer (i.e. consumer device). Additionally, Zintel (column 22, lines 6-15) further requires the controller device (i.e. producer device) to describe the protocols used to control it. Through all the manipulation that a producer device of Zintel is required to perform in response to requests from consumer devices, it is clear that Zintel

does not disclose, teach or even suggest the limitation that the producer devices not alter the configuration information therein in response to requests from consumer devices.

Further Petite does not cure this deficiency in Zintel since Petite (column 16, lines 1-9) describes how a site controller (producer device) receives request for information, commands, etc. and sends the appropriate response. With neither Zintel nor Petite separately disclosing this claimed limitation of independent Claims 1, 15 and 23, the combination of Zintel with Petite cannot disclose it either, and the Claims 1, 15 and 23 are, therefore allowable over Zintel and Petite.

The Claims 2-14, 16-22 and 24 are either directly or indirectly dependent upon Claims 1 or 15 and as such include all of the limitations of the claims from which they are dependent, and are also allowable for at least the reasons that Claims 1 and 15 are allowable.

Conclusion

It is believed that the foregoing amendments and remarks are fully responsive to the Office Action and that the claims herein should be allowable to the Applicants. In the event the Examiner has any queries regarding the instantly submitted response, the undersigned respectfully request the courtesy of a telephone conference to discuss any matters in need of attention.

If there are any additional charges with respect to this Response or otherwise, please charge them to Deposit Account No. 06-1130.

Respectfully Submitted,

CANTOR COLBURN LLP

By: _____
Daniel A. Gilmour
Date: May 19, 2008
Registration No. 59,059
55 Griffin Road South
Bloomfield, CT 06002
Telephone: (860) 286-2929
Facsimile: (860) 286-0115
Customer No. 23413

Docket No. 133684-1

(GS1-0033)